Filed 01/03/25 Page 1 of 4 Page ID #:1

NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF ACTION

Case 2:25-cv-00053-FMO-BFM Document 1

74677-00029/5383640.2

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendant Riot Games, Inc. ("Riot"), by and through its undersigned counsel and pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441 and § 1446, and in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 28 U.S. Code § 1338, hereby removes the above-captioned matter from the Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles (the "Superior Court") to the United States District Court for the Central District of California. As set forth in further detail below, the Superior Court action arises under the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. § 101, et seq., and is therefore subject to this Court's exclusive jurisdiction. In support thereof, Riot Games respectfully states as follows:

GROUNDS FOR REMOVAL — COPYRIGHT ACTION

- 1. Plaintiff Marc Wolstenholme ("Wolstenholme") commenced a civil action on October 19, 2024 in the Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles, Case No. 24-STCV-28643 (the "State Court Action"). Wolstenholme is representing himself pro se.
- 2. On December 5, 2024, Wolstenholme served Riot Games with the Complaint and Summons in the State Court Action.
- The Complaint consists of a Superior Court Judicial Counsel Form 3. PLD-C-001. In Section 8 of the form, Wolstenholme identifies his principal cause of action as: "Copyright Infringement: Specify as 'Copyright Infringement (17 U.S.C. § 501)." The form also states as "other allegations" "Vicarious Copyright Infringement, Unfair Competition, and Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress." Wolstenholme has not filed any further narrative statement of his claims.
- This Court has exclusive jurisdiction over all actions arising under the 4. Copyright Act. 28 U.S. Code § 1338; Vestron, Inc. v. Home Box Office, Inc., 839 F.2d 1380, 1381 (9th Cir. 1988) ("[F]ederal courts have exclusive jurisdiction over actions that arise under federal copyright law."). Wolstenholme's Complaint, while lacking any factual detail, states that he is asserting a claim for "copyright"

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

TIMELINESS OF REMOVAL

- 5. Riot's removal is timely under 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b) as it is being filed "within 30 days after receipt by the defendant, through service, or otherwise, of a copy of the initial pleading setting forth the claim for relief upon which such action ... is based."
- The Complaint and Summons were served on Riot on December 5, 6. 2024. *Murphy Bros. v. Michetti Pipe Stringing, Inc.*, 526 U.S. 344, 356 (1999) (when Complaint and Summons served concurrently, thirty-day period for removal begins from the date of service of process); see also Chacon v. San Bernardino, No. 5:24-CV-00140-MRA-SHK, 2024 WL 4291248, at *6 (C.D. Cal. July 19, 2024), report and recommendation adopted, 2024 WL 4291855 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2024) ("Thus, the thirty-day period for removal commences from the date of proper service of process, not by mere receipt of the complaint without any formal service.").

REMOVAL PROCEDURES

- 7. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a) because this district embraces the place where the removed action has been pending.
- True and correct copies of all pleadings filed in the State Court Action 8. are attached hereto as Exhibits A through J pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a).
- 9. As required by 28 U.S.C. § 1446(d), Riot will promptly file a copy of this Notice of Removal with the Clerk of the Superior Court for the County of Los Angeles.

10.	Written notice of the filin	g of the Notice	of Removal	will also be
served on W	olstenholme as required by	y 28 U.S.C. § 1	446(d).	

DATED: January 3, 2025 GREENBERG GLUSKER FIELDS CLAMAN & MACHTINGER LLP

By: /s/ Joshua M. Geller

AARON J. MOSS (SBN 190625)
JOSHUA M. GELLER (SBN 295412)
Attorneys for Defendant
Riot Games, Inc.